



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/526,735	03/16/2000	Manivannan Devarajan	6978.0098	2215

22852 7590 02/03/2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/526,735	DEVARAJAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Douglas B Blair	2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,298,341 to Mann et al. and U.S. Patent Number 5,905,862 to Hockstra.
2. As to claim 4, Hockstra teaches a system for interfacing multiple registrar systems, comprising: a first registrar system operable to register a domain name using an electronic mail interface (col. 5, lines 32-57); a second registrar system operable to register a domain name using a web-based interface (col. 5, lines 32-57); and means for interfacing the first registrar system and the second registrar system such that the first registrar system and the second registrar system are accessible from a single web page (col. 4, lines 42-67 and col. 5, lines 1-4); however Hockstra does not teach a systems for booking the domain names.

Mann teaches a system for booking a domain name using a web-based interface (col. 6, lines 51-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hockstra regarding a system with two means of registering a domain name with the teachings of Mann regarding booking a domain name because a domain name must be booked before it can be registered therefore combine the two features enhances convenience.

3. As to claim 6, Mann teaches a reservation database for storing forms including reservation information (col. 4, lines 19-39); a reservation server operable to receive reservation information, and generate a request to reserve a domain name based on the received reservation

information (col. 6, lines 28-55); a user unit operable to receive the request to reserve the domain name from the reservation server (col. 6, lines 28-55), and create an entry in a primary and secondary name server for that domain name (col. 5, lines 48-67 and col. 6, lines 1-11); a remote registration interface operable to receive the request from the user unit, and place the reservation information from the request into a form (col. 3, lines 60-67 and col. 4, lines 1-9); and a message tracking system operable to verify the reservation information in the form, and store the form in the reservation database (col. 4, lines 19-39).

4. As to claim 1 and 3, they feature the same limitations as claims 4 and 6, respectively and are thus rejected on the same basis as claims 4 and 6.

5. As to claim 7, Mann teaches a method for interfacing multiple registrar systems comprising the steps of: receiving a domain name (col. 4, lines 30-39); determining whether the domain name is available for booking (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-11); providing such information to a user via email or the web (col. 7, lines 28-55); selecting a registrar system operable to book the domain name using a web-based interface (col. 6, lines 28-55); booking the domain name using the selected registrar system (col. 6, lines 28-55); however Mann does not explicitly teach a second system using an email interface directly for booking a domain.

Hockstra teaches a system with both an email interface and a web-based interface for registering domain names with search engines (col. 5, lines 32-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Mann regarding the booking of a domain name via a web-based interface with the teachings of Hockstra regarding the use of both email interfaces and web-based interfaces to register domain names because both web-based and email

communications are common in the means of communicating information in the Internet environment.

6. As to claim 8, Hockstra teaches a method for registering the domain name using the first registrar system based on a selection of the first registrar system (col. 5, lines 32-57); and Mann teaches a system of reserving the domain name using the second registrar system based on selection of the second registrar system (col. 6, lines 28-55).

7. As to claim 10, Hockstra teaches a method of entering information into a form and storing the form in a reservation database.

8. As to claim 13, Hockstra teaches a method for interfacing multiple registrar systems comprising the steps of: receiving a domain name (col. 6, lines 33-62); directing a customer to a first web page based on a determination that the domain name is registered using a first registrar system (col. 5, lines 19-31); and directing the customer to a second web page based on a determination that the domain name is registered using a second registrar system, wherein the first registrar system is operable to register a domain name using an email interface, and the second registrar system is operable to book the domain name using a web-based interface (col. 5, lines 32-57); however Hockstra does not teach a system for booking the domain names.

Mann teaches a system for booking a domain name using a web-based interface (col. 6, lines 51-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hockstra regarding a system with two means of registering a domain name with the teachings of Mann regarding booking a domain name

because both web-based and email communications are common in the means of communicating information in the Internet environment.

9. As to claim 14, it features the same limitations as claim 7 and is therefore rejected on the same basis as claim 7.

10. Claims 2, 5, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,298,341 to Mann et al. and U.S. Patent Number 5,905,862 to Hockstra, in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,360,254 to Linden et al..

11. As to claim 5, Hockstra teaches a system comprising a registration database for storing templates including registration information (col. 4, lines 42-67 and col. 5, lines 1-4); and a registration server operable to enter registration information into a template (col. 5, lines 5-18); however the Mann-Hockstra combination fails to teach a customer confirmation method using email.

Linden teaches a method to transmit the template to a customer via email, receive the template back from the customer via electronic mail, and store the template in the registration database, wherein the registration information in the template is verified by the customer (col. 7, lines 52-67 and col. 8, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art to combine the teachings of the Mann-Hockstra combination regarding the registration of domain names with the teachings of Linden regarding using email for confirmations because email provides a convenient way to interact with a customer.

12. As to claims 2 and 9, they feature the same limitations as claim 5 and are thus rejected on the same basis as claim 5.

Art Unit: 2142

13. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,298,341 to Mann et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,905,862 to Hockstra, and U.S. Patent Number 6,360,254 to Linden et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,134,592 to Montulli.

14. As to claim 11, the teachings of the Mann-Hockstra-Linden combination combine to make claim 9 obvious; however none of the references in the Mann-Hockstra-Linden combination teach pre-populating a template with preexisting customer data.

Montulli teaches a method of pre-populating the form with registration information based on a determination that the customer is a preexisting customer (col. 7, lines 33-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Mann-Hockstra-Linden combination regarding the registration of domain names with the teachings of Montulli regarding pre-populating templates with pre-existing customer information because pre-populating prevents excessive typing (Montulli, col. 7, lines 51-61).

15. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,298,341 to Mann et al. and U.S. Patent Number 5,905,862 to Hockstra, in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,134,592 to Montulli.

16. As to claim 12, the teachings of the Mann-Hockstra combination combine to make claim 10 obvious; however neither Mann nor Hockstra teach pre-populating a template with preexisting customer data.

Montulli teaches a method of pre-populating the form with reservation information based on a determination that the customer is a preexisting customer (col. 7, lines 33-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Mann-Hockstra combination regarding the registration of domain names with the teachings of Montulli regarding pre-populating templates with pre-existing customer information because pre-populating prevents excessive typing (Montulli, col. 7, lines 51-61).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B Blair whose telephone number is 703-305-5267. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell can be reached on 703-305-9703. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

Douglas Blair
January 24, 2003

DBB

MEHMET B. GECKIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mehmet Geckil